

Exhibit 2

2:16-cr-046-GMN-PAL - January 8, 2018

1

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3
4 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)

5 Plaintiff,)

6 vs.)

7 CLIVEN D. BUNDY (1),)

RYAN C. BUNDY (2),)

8 AMMON E. BUNDY (3),)

RYAN W. PAYNE (4),)

9 Defendants.)

Case No. 2:16-cr-046-GMN-PAL

Las Vegas, Nevada

Monday, January 8, 2018

Courtroom 7C, 9:28 a.m.

MOTION TO DISMISS

10 C E R T I F I E D C O P Y

11
12 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
13 BEFORE THE HONORABLE GLORIA M. NAVARRO
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT CHIEF JUDGE

15 APPEARANCES:

16 For the Plaintiff:

17 UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

BY: STEVEN W. MYHRE

DANIEL R. SCHIESS

NADIA JANJUA AHMED

18 501 Las Vegas Boulevard South, Suite 1100

Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

19 (702) 388-6336

20
21 (Appearances continued on Page 2)

22 Court reporter: Heather K. Newman, RPR, CRR, CCR #774

333 South Las Vegas Boulevard

23 Las Vegas, NV 89101

24 (702) 471-0002 HN@nvd.uscourts.gov

25 Proceedings reported by machine shorthand, transcript produced
by computer-aided transcription.

1 APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

2 For the Defendant Cliven D. Bundy:

3 JUSTICE LAW CENTER
4 BY: BRET O. WHIPPLE
5 1100 South Tenth Street
6 Las Vegas, NV 89104
7 (702) 257-9500

8 For the Defendant Ryan C. Bundy:

9 RYAN C. BUNDY, PRO SE
10 THE FLETCHER FIRM, PC
11 BY: MAYSOUN FLETCHER
12 5510 South Fort Apache, Suite 5
13 Las Vegas, NV 89148
14 (702) 835-1542

15 For the Defendant Ammon E. Bundy:

16 HILL FIRM
17 BY: DANIEL HILL
18 228 South Fourth Street, 3rd Floor
19 Las Vegas, NV 89101
20 (702) 848-5000

21 JM PHILPOT ATTORNEYS AT LAW
22 BY: JAY MORGAN PHILPOT
23 1063 East Alpine Drive
24 Alpine, UT 84004
25 (801) 891-4499

For the Defendant Ryan W. Payne:

FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER'S OFFICE
BY: RYAN NORWOOD
BRENDA WEKSLER
411 East Bonneville Avenue, Suite 250
Las Vegas, NV 89101
(702) 388-6577

1 APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

2 For Intervenors LVRJ and Battle Born Media:

3 McLEITCHIE SHELL LLC
4 BY: MARGARET A. McLEITCHIE
5 701 East Bridger Avenue, Suite 520
6 Las Vegas, NV 89101
7 (702) 728-5300

8 Also present:

9 Sharon Gavin, FBI Special Agent
10 Joel Willis, FBI Special Agent
11 Mike Abercrombie, FBI Special Agent

12 Mamie Ott, Legal Assistant

13 Nicole Reitz, IT
14 Brian Glynn, IT
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA; MONDAY, JANUARY 8, 2018; 9:28 A.M.

2 --oOo--

3 P R O C E E D I N G S

4 COURTROOM ADMINISTRATOR: All rise.

5 THE COURT: Thank you. You may be seated.

6 COURTROOM ADMINISTRATOR: This is the time set for
7 the Motion Hearing regarding Documents No. 2883 and 2906,
8 sealed Motions to Dismiss and Document No. 3010, Motion to
9 Unseal Intervenor -- by Intervenor in Case Number
10 2:16-cr-046-GMN-PAL, United States of America vs. Cliven Bundy,
11 Ryan Bundy, Ammon Bundy, and Ryan Payne.

12 Counsel, please make your appearances for the record.

13 MR. MYHRE: Good morning, Your Honor. Steve Myhre,
14 Dan Schiess, Nadia Ahmed on behalf of the United States.

15 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Schiess. Good morning,
16 Ms. Ahmed, and good morning, Mr. Myhre.

17 MR. WHIPPLE: Good morning, Your Honor.
18 Brett Whipple -- as well Happy New Year to you. Brett Whipple
19 on behalf of Mr. Cliven Bundy.

20 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Whipple, Mr. Bundy.

21 PRO SE RYAN BUNDY: Ryan C. of the Bundy family here
22 by special appearance with Maysoun Fletcher assisting and on --
23 and for the record, I reserve all right.

24 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Bundy. Good morning,
25 Ms. Fletcher.

1 MR. HILL: Good morning and Happy New Year,
2 Your Honor. Dan Hill along with Morgan Philpot here on behalf
3 of Ammon Bundy.

4 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Hill, Mr. Philpot and
5 Mr. Bundy.

6 MS. WEKSLER: Good morning, Your Honor.
7 Brenda Weksler and Ryan Norwood on behalf of Mr. Payne.

8 THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Weksler, Mr. Norwood,
9 and good morning, Mr. Payne.

10 So before we begin, I would like to make some
11 preliminary remarks just to --

12 MS. McLEITCHIE: Good morning, Your Honor.
13 Maggie McLetchie --

14 THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry.

15 MS. McLEITCHIE: -- for the Intervenors Las Vegas
16 Review Journal and Battle Born Media.

17 THE COURT: Thank you. Good morning, Ms. McLetchie.

18 All right. So before we begin, I just wanted to make
19 some preliminary remarks to remind everyone and to set clear
20 the expectations of how court will be conducted this morning.

21 Please remember this is a courtroom; it is not a
22 sporting event. So it is never appropriate to make any
23 expression of your opinion, whether verbally or through your
24 body language, no matter how much you may agree or disagree
25 with what is being said.

1 In addition, we do not allow electronic devices in
2 the courtroom. There is no audio or video recording permitted
3 in the courtroom. Therefore, only the attorneys are permitted
4 to have electronic devices so that they may be able to do their
5 job. There is one paralegal -- I think I see him back there --
6 who is permitted to have an electronic device so long as the
7 audio and speaker is covered.

8 Do you have that with you today, sir?

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I kept it in my briefcase,
10 Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir.

12 So please be aware that the marshals are authorized
13 to remove any individual who is seen with an electronic device,
14 whether it's on or off. Whether it's in vibrate or privacy
15 mode, does not matter. If you have the device, they will be
16 able to remove you and you may not be able to re-enter.
17 Likewise, if you make any distracting or inappropriate
18 expressions, the marshals also have the authority to remove you
19 in order to preserve the atmosphere in the courtroom.

20 Now, the Court has reviewed the following briefs:
21 Number 83 -- I'm sorry -- 2883 is the sealed version. The
22 public version is 3057. The Court has also reviewed Docket No.
23 2906. The public version of that is 3058. And the Court has
24 also reviewed Documents 3082 and 3085. The public versions of
25 those documents are 3087 and 3088.

1 The Court does grant Cliven Bundy's Motion for
2 Joinder, which is Number 3096.

3 Now, in Payne's Motion to Dismiss, Mr. Payne's Motion
4 to Dismiss, which is Number 3085, he does request that the
5 Indictment be dismissed based on three possible theories:

6 The first being that the case barred by the double
7 jeopardy clause; the second being that outrageous government
8 conduct that amounts to a due process violation justifies
9 dismissal; and the third theory is that dismissal under the
10 Court's supervisory power for outrageous governmental
11 misconduct is appropriate.

12 The Court first will address the double jeopardy
13 argument.

14 Double jeopardy does attach once a jury has been
15 sworn. Pursuant to *United States v. Alexander*, Ninth Circuit
16 case decided in 1998, "If a case is dismissed after jeopardy
17 attaches but before the jury reaches a verdict, a defendant may
18 be tried again for the same crime only in two circumstances:
19 Number one, if he consents to the dismissal, or number two, if
20 the district court determines that the dismissal was required
21 by manifest necessity," quoting from *Chapman*, Ninth Circuit
22 case decided in 2008 as well as *Oregon v. Kennedy*, United
23 States Supreme Court case decided in 1982. Here, the Court has
24 already granted the mistrial based on manifest necessity so it
25 follows that the defendants may be retried under this theory.

1 However, defendant Payne argues that the Double
2 Jeopardy Clause still bars retrial "where the government
3 conduct in question is intended to 'goad' the defendant into
4 moving for a mistrial," quoting *Oregon v. Kennedy*. Considering
5 what has occurred throughout the trial up to this point, the
6 Court finds no evidence that the government's failure to
7 disclose evidence was a strategy decision on the prosecution's
8 part to abort the trial. Rather, it appears the government has
9 attempted to provide the defense with the identified *Brady*
10 evidence in order to move forward with trial and not to
11 purposely goad the defense into moving for mistrial.

12 For these reasons, the Court finds the Double
13 Jeopardy Clause does not bar retrial.

14 Next we have the claim of outrageous government
15 conduct and that a dismissal is appropriate for either --
16 either under a due process violation theory or under the
17 Court's supervisory powers.

18 "A district court may dismiss an Indictment on the
19 ground of outrageous government conduct if the conduct amounts
20 to due process violation," quoting from *Simpson*, Ninth Circuit
21 case. If the conduct does not rise to the level of a due
22 process violation, the Court may nonetheless dismiss a case for
23 outrageous government misconduct under its supervisory powers.

24 So turning first to the due process violation
25 allegation.

1 To violate due process, governmental conduct must be,
2 and I quote, "so grossly shocking and so outrageous as to
3 violate the universal sense of justice," quoting from *United*
4 *States v. Restrepo*, Ninth Circuit case decided in '91, and also
5 *United States vs. Ramirez*, Supreme Court case decided in 1983.

6 Due process is not violated unless the conduct is
7 attributable to and directed by the government, *United States*
8 *v. Barrera-Moreno*, Ninth Circuit case decided in 1991.

9 "Outrageous government conduct occurs when the
10 actions of law enforcement officers or informants are so
11 outrageous that due process principles would absolutely bar the
12 government from invoking judicial processes to obtain a
13 conviction," *United States v. Archie*, which is 2016 case out of
14 the District of Nevada as well as *United States v. Black*, Ninth
15 Circuit case decided in 2013 and *United States v. Russell*, U.S.
16 Supreme Court case decided in 1973.

17 Now, dismissal under this "extremely high" standard
18 is appropriate only in "extreme cases in which the government's
19 conduct violates fundamental fairness," *U.S. v. Pedrin*,
20 P-e-d-r-i-n, Ninth Circuit case decided in 2015 quoting from
21 *United States v. Smith*, Ninth Circuit decided in 1991.

22 So when reviewing a claim alleging that the
23 Indictment should be dismissed because the government's conduct
24 was outrageous, evidence is viewed in the light most favorable
25 to the government, *United States v. Gurolla*, G-u-r-o-l-l-a,

1 Ninth Circuit case decided 2003.

2 The concept of outrageous government conduct focuses
3 on the government's actions, *United States v. Restrepo*.

4 Here in this case, both the prosecution and the
5 investigative agencies are equally responsible for the failure
6 to produce *Brady* materials to the defense. In the prior
7 mistrial hearing, the Court explained, in detail, that numerous
8 documents, and the information contained in such documents,
9 should have been provided to the defense and the Court finds
10 this conduct especially egregious because the government chose
11 not to provide this evidence, even after the defense
12 specifically requested it.

13 The Court finds the prosecution's representations
14 that it was unaware of the materiality of the *Brady* evidence is
15 grossly shocking. The prosecution was on notice after the
16 Court's order, which is on the docket, Number 2770, that a
17 self-defense theory may become relevant if the defense was able
18 to provide an offer of proof, outside the presence of the jury.
19 Moreover, in that same order, Number 2770, the Court
20 specifically denied the government's motion to exclude all the
21 reference to perceived government misconduct to the extent it
22 is relevant to defenses raised by the defendants. So the
23 government was well aware that theories of self-defense,
24 provocation, and intimidation might become relevant if the
25 defense could provide a sufficient offer of proof to the Court.

1 However, the prosecution denied the defense its opportunity to
2 provide favorable evidence to support their theories as a
3 result of the government's withholding of evidence and this
4 amounts to a *Brady* violation.

5 For example, the government claims it failed to
6 disclose this evidence because the FBI did not provide the
7 documents to the prosecution team. However, the prosecutor has
8 a duty to learn of favorable evidence known to other government
9 agents, including the police, if those persons were involved in
10 the investigation or prosecution of the case, citing *Kyles v.*
11 *Whitley*, United States Supreme Court case decided 1995.
12 Clearly, the FBI was involved in the prosecution of this case.
13 Based on the prosecution's failure to look for evidence outside
14 of that provided by the FBI and the FBI's failure to provide
15 evidence that is potentially exculpatory to the prosecution for
16 discovery purposes, the Court finds that a universal sense of
17 justice has been violated. The Court is convinced that there
18 is still outstanding *Brady* discovery based on the government's
19 most recent assertion that, and I quote, "the government
20 expects a thorough review of the discovery will result in the
21 production of other documents to the defense," and I'm citing
22 from the most recent filing by the government, Number 3081,
23 Page 45, Footnote 20.

24 Alternatively, a district court may exercise its
25 supervisory powers in three different enumerated ways:

1 Number one, "to remedy unconstitutional or statutory
2 violation"; number two, "to protect judicial integrity by
3 ensuring that a conviction rests on appropriate considerations
4 validly before a jury"; or number three, "to deter future
5 illegal conduct," quoting from *Simpson*, Ninth Circuit case
6 decided '91.

7 In *United States vs. W. R. Grace*, the Ninth Circuit
8 clarified that the exercise of the Court's inherent powers is
9 not limited to these three grounds enumerated in *Simpson*, and
10 that was an en banc decision by the Ninth Circuit in 2008.

11 "Dismissal is appropriate when the investigatory or
12 prosecutorial process has violated a federal Constitution or
13 statutory right and no lesser remedial action is available,"
14 quoting from *Barrera-Moreno*.

15 The Ninth Circuit has recognized that exercise of a
16 supervisory power is an appropriate means of policing ethical
17 misconduct by prosecutors, *United States v. Lopez*, Ninth
18 Circuit case decided in 1993.

19 So "dismissal under the Court's supervisory powers
20 for prosecutorial misconduct requires both:

21 "Number one, flagrant misbehavior, and number two,
22 substantial prejudice," citing *United States v. Kearns*,
23 K-e-a-r-n-s, Ninth Circuit case decided in 1993.

24 Neither accidental nor mere negligent governmental
25 conduct is sufficient. The idea of prejudice entails that the

1 government's conduct had at least some impact on the verdict
2 and thus redounded to the defendant's prejudice.

3 In order for the Court to dismiss an Indictment under
4 the supervisory powers, the Court must find that there has been
5 flagrant prosecutorial misconduct, substantial prejudice to the
6 defendants, and that no lesser remedial action is available.

7 The Court found previously that there had been
8 multiple *Brady* violations because the government failed to
9 produce evidence that bolstered the defense and was useful to
10 rebut the government's theory. Additionally, the Court
11 concluded that the government willfully failed to disclose
12 potentially exculpatory, favorable and material information,
13 including, but not limited to, the following documents and
14 their contents:

15 The FBI Law Enforcement Operation order; the FBI
16 Burke 302 about Agent Egbert; the FBI 302 about BLM Agent
17 Delmolino authored by FBI Agent Willis; the FBI 302 about BLM
18 Special Agent Felix observing the LP/OP, the Listening
19 Post/Operation Post; the FBI 302 about BLM Racker and his
20 assignment to the LP/OP; the unredacted FBI TOC log; and the
21 various threat assessments created by different agencies,
22 including the BLM and FBI.

23 It seems no coincidence that most, if not all, of
24 these documents are authored by the FBI.

25 I do need to make one correction. Apparently I

1 previously identified -- or should I say misidentified -- a
2 report or some information as being contained in an Internal
3 Affairs report. It was actually in the FBI Joint Terrorism
4 Task Force report, the JTTF prepared on March 14th of 2014.
5 This is the document that recorded that at a meeting Love had
6 stated that he had requested that the FBI place a surveillance
7 camera.

8 So the Court looks to *Chapman, U.S. v. Chapman*. And
9 in *Chapman*, the district court dismissed an Indictment pursuant
10 to its supervisory powers based on discovery violations that
11 involved 650 pages of undisclosed documents that the Court
12 classified as *Brady* material. The district court in *Chapman*
13 found that "the Assistant U.S. Attorney acted flagrantly,
14 willfully and in bad faith" and that he had made "affirmative
15 misrepresentations to the Court," that the defendants would be
16 prejudiced by a new trial and that no lesser standard would
17 adequately remedy the harm done after reviewing the totality of
18 the proceedings before it.

19 The Ninth Circuit held that the *Chapman* court did not
20 abuse its discretion by dismissing the Indictment pursuant to
21 its supervisory powers.

22 Here, defendant Payne argues that the government's
23 conduct was more egregious than the facts before the *Chapman*
24 court. He argues that there were more than mere hints of the
25 discovery issues on the eve of trial and that there was at

1 least a thousand pages of discovery disclosed between
2 November 8th and December 15th of 2017, all which should have
3 been disclosed by October 1st.

4 The government argues that this case is different
5 from the *Chapman* case because here the prosecution did not fail
6 to produce evidence it knew to be material. The government
7 contends it merely inadvertently failed to disclose evidence,
8 or that the defense had all the information in the undisclosed
9 documents because the government had previously provided other
10 documents with substantially the same content. Further, the
11 government contends that the documents that the Court ruled to
12 be untimely disclosed, in violation of *Brady*, not including the
13 OIG reports, is actually fewer than 200 pages.

14 "The prosecutor has a 'sworn duty' to assure that the
15 defendant has a fair and impartial trial. His interest in a
16 particular case is not necessarily to win, but to do justice,"
17 citing from *Chapman*. Here, the prosecution seems to have
18 minimized the extent of prosecutorial misconduct by arguing
19 that they believed the various items previously undisclosed,
20 like the threat assessments, were not helpful or exculpatory,
21 or that they did not need to be -- or that they did not provide
22 evidence that snipers had been inserted or did not need to,
23 because the use of snipers was already known to the defense.
24 Another argument is that the FBI did not provide the
25 information to the prosecution.

1 The Court acknowledges that merely negligent
2 government conduct is not sufficient to establish flagrant
3 misbehavior. However, as the appellate court in *Chapman*
4 stated, "we never suggested that flagrant misbehavior does not
5 embrace reckless disregard for the prosecution's constitutional
6 obligations." In other words, reckless disregard may amount to
7 flagrant misbehavior. As the Court has noted, a prosecutor has
8 an ongoing duty to learn of favorable evidence known to other
9 government agents, including the police, if those persons are
10 involved in the investigation or prosecution of the case.
11 Therefore, the fact that the prosecution failed to look beyond
12 the files provided by the FBI is not mere negligence; it is a
13 reckless disregard for its Constitution obligations to learn
14 and seek out favorable evidence. The prosecution's reliance on
15 the FBI to provide the required information amounted to an
16 intentional abdication of its responsibility.

17 For example, the prosecution was aware of the
18 existence of a camera set to provide a live feed. The claims
19 that the FBI 302 authored by Burke on April 8th of 2014 about
20 Egbert led the prosecution to believe that it did not need to
21 follow up on the camera feed because the 302 report said that
22 the camera was not configured to record. But the prosecution's
23 decision to not follow up was not mere negligence. As the
24 Court noted previously, the government's proffer that views
25 from a surveillance camera were never viewed by anyone nor

1 recorded or reported in some format was simply inconceivable.
2 That the prosecution accepted this implausible claim, whether
3 it was provided by the FBI, is just another example of its
4 reckless disregard to fulfill its constitutional duties to
5 learn about evidence favorable to the defense that may have
6 existed as a result of someone's notes and observations of the
7 surveillance camera's live feed of the Bundy Ranch.

8 Further, the prosecutors' alleged reliance on the
9 information in the FBI files was misplaced. The Court finds
10 that the FBI's failure to timely produce information to the
11 prosecution amounts to reckless disregard or flagrant
12 misbehavior, especially in light of the fact that the FBI was
13 directly involved in the operation, prior to the operation,
14 during, and after the alleged conspiracy timeline. The Court
15 seriously questions why the FBI inexplicably placed (or perhaps
16 hid) potentially exculpatory electronic information about the
17 placement of FBI snipers in such an unconventional location, on
18 a thumb drive, inside a vehicle, for over three years.
19 Compounding the Court's concern is that the FBI had almost four
20 full years to prepare the trial and two years to disclose the
21 information to the prosecution and that their agents were
22 physically present during the last two trials where the
23 existence of snipers was contentiously debated. Regardless,
24 the Court is not required to identify the responsible persons
25 with such specificity. And I add, the Court is not aware of

1 any other situation where the FBI has acted in disregard such
2 as this. The law attributes, nevertheless, the conduct,
3 whether it's of the FBI or other enforcement -- law enforcement
4 agencies under these circumstances, to the government
5 prosecution team, citing *United States vs. Barrera-Moreno*
6 decided by the Ninth Circuit in 1991, analyzing the Court's
7 supervisory power, stating, and I quote, that "dismissal is
8 appropriate when the investigatory or prosecutorial process has
9 violated a federal constitutional or statutory right and no
10 lesser remedial action is available."

11 This case is distinguished from *Chapman* in that the
12 prosecution in this case has kept a record of what has been
13 produced and what has not been produced. The Court also
14 recognizes that the government has attempted to locate all
15 outstanding discovery. However, like *Chapman*, this case
16 involves voluminous discovery and the government willfully
17 failed to produce *Brady* material. Additionally, the government
18 made several misrepresentations to the defense, and to the
19 Court, regarding the existence of the cameras, the snipers, the
20 materiality of prior threat assessments and its diligent and
21 fully complying -- its diligence in fully complying with its
22 constitutional obligations. For example, representations about
23 whether individuals were technically "snipers" or not "snipers"
24 was disingenuous, especially considering that the undisclosed
25 documents authored by the FBI, the ones located on the thumb

1 drive inside a vehicle, expressly refer to these individuals as
2 "snipers" at least three different occasions. Likewise,
3 arguments about whether they were actually "deployed" or merely
4 "training" was a deliberate attempt to mislead and to obscure
5 the truth. These are arguments for closing argument and not a
6 reason to withhold information. Numerous other instances are
7 noted by the defense in the brief and the Court does not
8 disagree with these representations.

9 Thus, the Court does find that there has been
10 flagrant prosecutorial misconduct in this case even if the
11 documents themselves were not intentionally withheld from the
12 defense.

13 Defendant Payne argues that the defense has been
14 prejudiced because there -- they have already set forth the
15 legal and factual particulars of their defense by revealing
16 voir dire strategy, the evidence they expect to support their
17 defense in their opening statements, revealing their strategy
18 in cross-examination, and the defense correctly avers that this
19 revealed information will allow the government to try and
20 correct its faltering case. Specifically, the defense notes
21 the lack of success of the government at prior trials; the tone
22 and the direction of the jury questions in this case, both
23 those questions that were read and not read to the witness; and
24 the new yet unexplored issues related to the Wooten e-mail, the
25 FBI special agent who was formally assigned to lead the

1 investigation but abruptly was removed in February of 2017,
2 allegedly by the prosecution because he complained of Special
3 Agent in Charge Dan Love's misconduct, the investigating law
4 enforcement officer's bias, the government's bias, and the
5 failure to disclose exculpatory evidence.

6 The Court agrees that retrying the case would only
7 advantage the government by allowing them to strengthen their
8 witnesses' testimony based on the knowledge gained from the
9 information provided by the defense and revealed thus far. The
10 government would be able to perfect its opening statements
11 based on the revealed defense strategy in its opening and the
12 government would also be able to conduct more strategic voir
13 dire at the retrial.

14 The Court is troubled by the prosecution's failure to
15 look beyond the FBI file that was provided and construes the
16 *Brady* violations in concert as a reckless disregard of its
17 discovery obligations. The government's recklessness and the
18 prejudice the defendants will suffer as a result of a retrial
19 warrant the extreme measure of dismissing the Indictment
20 because no lesser sanction would adequately deter -- deter
21 future investigatory and prosecutorial misconduct.

22 The government is only proposed a new trial as the
23 appropriate remedy for their discovery violations. However,
24 its conduct has caused the integrity of a future trial and any
25 resulting conviction to be even more questionable. Both the

1 defense and the community possess the right to expect a fair
2 process with a reliable conclusion. Therefore, it is the
3 Court's position that none of the alternative sanctions
4 available are as certain to impress the government with the
5 Court's resoluteness in holding prosecutors and their
6 investigative agencies to the ethical standards which regulate
7 the legal profession as a whole.

8 The Court finds that the government's conduct in this
9 case was indeed outrageous, amounting to a due process
10 violation, and that a new trial is not an adequate sanction for
11 this due process violation.

12 Even if the government's conduct did not rise to the
13 level of a due process violation, the Court would nonetheless
14 dismiss under its supervisory powers because there has been
15 flagrant misconduct, substantial prejudice, and no lesser
16 remedy is sufficient. Dismissal is necessary as to these four
17 defendants: Ryan Payne, Ryan Bundy, Ammon Bundy, and Cliven
18 Bundy, and dismissal is justified for all three of the
19 enumerated reasons provided by the law:

20 Number one, to properly remedy the constitutional
21 violation; number two, to protect judicial integrity by
22 ensuring that a conviction rests only on appropriate
23 considerations validly before a jury; and number three, to
24 deter future illegal conduct.

25 It is herein ordered that the defendants' Motion to

1 Dismiss with prejudice, Number 2883, public version 3057, as
2 well as Document No. 2906, public version 3058, and
3 Document 3082 and 3085, public version 3087 and 3088, are
4 hereby granted.

5 The Court hereby vacates the detention orders for
6 Cliven Bundy. The Court vacates the pretrial release orders
7 and exonerates the bonds of Ryan Payne, Ryan Bundy, and Ammon
8 Bundy. Mr. Payne is still to report to the U.S. Marshal's
9 Office immediately per Judge Brown's order from Oregon, but
10 rather than having you remanded into custody right now
11 immediately, I will order you to report to the U.S. Marshal's
12 Office as soon as this hearing is concluded.

13 The Calendar Call in trial date is likewise vacated
14 as to these four defendants, and the trial for the remaining
15 defendants will remain scheduled for February 26th at 8:30 a.m.
16 with Calendar Call February 15th at 9:00 a.m.

17 So the Court will take about a 15-minute recess.
18 It's 9:56 now. So, about until 10:15 so that the proper
19 paperwork can be provided to the defendants and then we'll
20 resume and take up the Intervenor's Motion to Unseal, which is
21 number 3010 on the docket.

22 COURTROOM ADMINISTRATOR: All rise.

23 Off record.

24 (Recess was taken at 9:56 a.m.)

25 ///

HEATHER K. NEWMAN, FOCR, RPR, CCR 774 (702) 471-0002